THEOLOGY

A MONTHLY REVIEW

OL. LII. No. 351 SEPTEMBER, 1949

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

Editorial Notes

Gifford Lectures, 1947 - - - - *V. A. Demant*

The Unction of the Sick in the Western Church - - - - - *T. W. Crafer*

The Origin of the Decalogue - - *W. K. Lowther Clarke*

For full list of contents see within.

Edited by Alec R. Vidler at Windsor Castle, and published by the S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C. 2.

per copy. 12s. per annum, post free.

he U.S.A. $3.60 payable to the Macmillan Co., 60 Fifth Avenue New York 11, N.Y.

THEOLOGY

Editorial communications should be addressed to: The Rev. Alec R. Vidler, D.D., 8, The Cloisters, Windsor Castle, Berks. (MSS should not exceed 3,500 words, and should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed envelope.)

Business communications (including books for review) to: The S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C.2.

Advisory Committee

Montgomery Belgion
The Rev. Frank Bennett
The Rev. L. J. Collins
The Rev. W. W. S. March
The Rev. Prof. E. C. Ratcliff
The Rev. Prof. Norman Sykes, D.Phil.

Editorial Representative in the U.S.A.: **The Rev. W. Norman Pittenger, General Theological Seminary, Chelsea Square, New York City**

CONTENTS

		PAGE
Editorial Notes		321
Gifford Lectures, 1947	*V. A. Demant*	322
The Unction of the Sick in the Western Church	*T. W. Crafer*	327
The Origin of the Decalogue	*W. K. Lowther Clarke*	333
Correspondence:		
New Translation of the Bible	*T. S. Eliot*	336
The Ministry	*Gregory Dix, O.S.B., and Norman Sykes*	338
Book Reviews:		
Harold Anson, *T. B. Strong*	*Adam Fox*	346
C. B. Moss, *The Old Catholic Movement*	*H. R. T. Brandreth*	347
H. L. Martensen, *Jacob Boehme*	*P. R. P. Barker*	349
H. E. Roberts, *Notes on Medieval Monasteries and Minsters*	*J. C. Dickinson*	350
Elmer A. Leslie, *The Psalms*	*E. W. Heaton*	351
Leslie Paul, *The Meaning of Human Existence;* Nicolas Berdyaev, *Towards a New Epoch;* C. S. Lewis, *Transposition*	*Charles Tompkins*	352
W. D. Morris, *The Christian Origins of Social Revolt*	*W. G. Symons*	354
G. Kaftal, *St Catherine in Tuscan Painting;* E. K. Ellis, *St Catharine of Siena.*	*J. H. L. Waterson*	356
Shorter Notices		357
Books Received		360

THEOLOGY

VOL. LII SEPTEMBER, 1949 No. 351

Editorial Notes

FATHER GROSER'S *Politics and Persons*[1] is a combination of autobiography and political pamphleteering. In a foreword Professor Tawney remarks that "the great art of complicating the simple and obscuring the obvious, by which the authentic intellectual proves his title to that proud name, is not one which the author has felt called on to acquire." Without designing to do so, Father Groser has written a document of considerable importance for the social and political history of England in the first half of this century. The vivid, but never rhetorical, account of the conditions which he encountered in the slums of Newcastle-on-Tyne and East London may be specially recommended to those who are too young to remember a time when it seemed outrageous for a clergyman to become a Socialist. Father Groser's narrative does more than his arguments to open the way to a sympathetic understanding of the Labour movement during the past twenty-five years. Nor is it likely that a more sincere or persuasive appeal to vote Labour at the next General Election will be produced.

* * * * *

William Paton[2] by Margaret Sinclair is a disappointing book. Paton was a great missionary and ecumenical statesman. But this book, though of course it contains other matter, leaves on the mind chiefly the impression of an endless number of places visited by an incessant traveller. Paton deserved something better than a Baedeker biography. A shorter book, which concentrated on characterization of the man and on an appraisal of the causes that he served with fine imagination and tireless devotion, would have been a worthier memorial and would have been more likely to inspire others to follow in his train. Never were men of Paton's quality and outlook more needed.

* * * * *

Among prolific episcopal authors the present Bishop of London is already a formidable rival to the late Archbishop of Canterbury. His book, *The Church, its Nature, Structure, and Function*,[3] which contains the (three) Frederick Denison Maurice Lectures delivered in 1947, covers familiar ground. It does not appear to us that the Bishop shares Maurice's theological perspective as much as he supposes. At the same time, he writes much more clearly, concisely, and confidently than Maurice did. This is surely an advantage. But

[1] S.C.M. Press. 7s. 6d. [2] S.C.M. Press. 15s.
[3] Hodder and Stoughton. 6s.

is it? We can a little sympathize with, though we cannot approve, th remark of a heckler which the Bishop ingenuously reports on p. 90.

* * * * *

The appearance in England of a translation of Fr Emile Mersch great work on *Le Corps Mystique du Christ* is to be warmly we comed. The translation (by J. R. Kelly, S.J.) is entitled *The Whol Christ: the Historical Development of the Doctrine of the Mystica Body in Scripture and Tradition*;[1] it appears to have been publishe in the U.S.A. as long ago as in 1938. The original French edition wa reviewed in THEOLOGY, November, 1933, by the Rev. Humphre Beevor. See also an article by the Rev. N. J. Blow in THEOLOGY May, 1947.

* * * * *

The Literary Qualities of the Prayer Book[2] by the Rev. Joh Watson is one of the most interesting of the books that have bee prompted by the Prayer Book anniversary celebrations. A consider able amount of original thought and research lies behind it, and i will be of permanent value especially to those who are responsibl for reading the Prayer Book services aloud.

Gifford Lectures, 1947

IN a note (on a different matter) Professor Brunner suggests that history of the Gifford Lectures might be written, and Christophe Dawson more or less begins the task in some illustrative material o his lectures.

Such a history would certainly regard the appearance of the tw 1947 series as a unique landmark in the great enterprise endowed b Lord Gifford.[3] For in that year we have two sets by different author and of entirely different treatments, on the same kind of subject— namely, the religious foundation of civilization and culture. Th choice of subject offers no mystery. Civilization has become problem atic. What is arresting, rather than this synchronization of theme, i that each series is a treatise on Natural Theology by a writer who i a believer in revealed religion and who holds that natural theolog derives from a supernatural and historic faith. This, in a way, shoul put even more strain on the interpretation of the Gifford Trust tha Karl Barth's assertion that he would serve the cause of natura theology by attacking its validity.

---

[1] Dennis Dobson. 30s. [2] A.P.C.K., Dublin. 1s. 6d.

[3] *Christianity and Civilization*. By Emil Brunner: First Part, Foundations Gifford Lectures delivered at the University of St Andrews, 1947. (Nisbet, 10s.) *Religion and Culture*. By Christopher Dawson; Gifford Lectures delivered i the University of Edinburgh, 1947. (Sheed and Ward, 10s. 6d.)

A situation which compelled a choice of two such lecturers is a good illustration of what one of their predecessors, Professor A. E. Taylor, points out—namely, that "In Christian societies natural theology has only been pursued with steady devotion by men who, in point of fact, were earnest believers in an historical self-disclosure of the divine, and active adherents of a positive institutional religion."[1]

Brunner is not working with this question in mind and would probably be uneasy at that way of putting it. His clear and confident treatment is an example of natural theology without conscious adherence to the idea. It is perhaps Brunner's great contribution to be willing valiantly to be dragged into formulating natural theology in order to illuminate the human problem of our time, and to do this out of a theological position that reduces the natural element of theology to a minimum. Dawson, on the other hand, writing as an historian of culture, believes that it is a recurring feature of all the great religions; and one of the main results of his Giffords is to establish natural theology on a much older, deeper, and wider basis than the rational form it took after the Enlightenment—the only form in which the theologians of the protestant tradition bothered to know it.

Emil Brunner embarks upon what he calls "a Christian doctrine of the foundations of civilization." This is not, however, an account, in terms of Christian anthropology, of the impulse which makes civilization, its vicissitudes, and the forces that imperil it. Part II may take up this subject. But it looks as if Brunner had been daunted therefrom at the start by the fact that there have been high civilizations before and independent of Christianity. What he does, therefore, is to describe some of the chief human preoccupations and tasks as Christian faith enables us to see them. This first volume deals with problems; the second will deal with the activities.[2]

The problems here treated are those of Being, of Time, of Meaning, Man's place in the Universe, Personality, Justice, Freedom, and Creativity. These Brunner calls "the culture-transcendent presuppositions of every culture," which form one of three main elements in Civilization, the other two being natural factors like geography and men's physical and spiritual abilities.

But the matters selected are the preoccupation of only the classical-Christian Western Culture; many of the great civilizations hardly raised these questions. And there is a further limitation; the questions are stated mainly in the setting of the contrast between Christianity of the Reformation type and modern idealist and rationalist secularism. This setting is too near our modern situation to tap the sources of healing for the illness of civilization, which is Dr Brun-

[1] *The Faith of a Moralist*, Vol. I, p. 20.

[2] By the kindness of Dr Brunner I am able to announce that the forthcoming Part II is entitled *A Christian Interpretation of Civilization*, and its lectures deal with Technics, Science, Tradition and Renewal, Education, Work, Art, Material Goods, Social Habit and Law, Power and the Christian Idea of Civilization, with a conclusion called Christianity beyond Civilization.

ner's real concern. But it provides him with an opportunity f setting out with fine learning, perception, and style the issues which he is at his best—namely, the contrast between Christian a idealist presuppositions.

The contrast between the idea of Creation and all forms monism is a reminder repeatedly necessary; on the problems Time and History he is at his most brilliant. While the demolitic of Progress is rather kicking a dead horse, it is useful to have it sa again that the myth began with the philosophers and was tra planted to science. There is a good statement of the debate betwe Greek idealism and Biblical revelation, but the former is too easi made the basis of modern evolutionary rationalism. Brunner rec nizes that "the idealism of modern times, having branched off fro Christianity and left Christian truth behind, could not fail to b come irreligious, and contained a dangerous element of rebellic which was lacking in the old Platonism"—but what light is real wanted upon is the nature of this "branching off" or "rebellion Something out of Christendom itself got loose from the pietas whi was common to Christianity and Paganism but which is absent fro both Reformation and Renaissance outlooks. The fact that secula ism is a phenomenon of Christendom needs explanation. Perhaps future Gifford Lecturer will elucidate this and also the close depen ence of science upon Christendom which has been slurred over b cause of the secondary conflicts of Church and scientific workers.

Brunner states, again with his accustomed precision, the issue b tween collectivism and individualism, both alien to personality, a he asserts that Marxism and Capitalism are twin brothers. There a sidelights on Marx, Nietzsche, and Comte, somewhat facile in place In the lecture on justice, which epitomizes his *Justice and the Soci Order*, Brunner raises the severe question of technocratic pseud religion. It is tantalizing to have this tremendous question opene and then related only to the Prometheus myth and to the paradox determinism and freedom and hubris—without a hint as to wh Christian statesmanship in this matter would entail.

In these lectures Brunner shows a more deliberate use of Natur Law than in his earlier writings, and calls attention to the differen between a Christian and humanist account of it. But it comes in t much as a useful lever at ticklish points. If the Theology of Natur Law had informed the thought at its roots, we might have bee spared the one big disastrous opposition to which Dr Brunner co mits himself—namely, between what he calls God knowledge a world knowledge. This seems to be due to a position for which t only knowledge of God is revealed; it skips the hurdles a Christia philosopher must face in relation to science; and it encourages somewhat contemptuous waiving away of the spiritual struggle the scientist seeking sagacity.

The other series of Gifford Lectures is by that wisest and mo learned of our historians, and philosopher of history, Mr Christoph Dawson. It is entitled *Religion and Culture*, and deals with t

connexion between these two activities of man, a connexion traced by Mr Dawson's encyclopedic insight through the whole history of religions. It expounds a double truth—namely, that no religious faith is robust unless it produces its proper culture and that every culture, being the embodiment of a religion, may die for want of renewal by it.

Dawson has done little else for twenty years than show how the crisis of Western Civilization is due to the separation of its culture from its religious basis, and he here supports this aim with a wonderfully matured presentation of the history of religion.

We are living, Mr Dawson contends, with aims and the remnant of a civilized culture from the past, but this humanist culture is being replaced by a pseudo-culture of technology. He shows how culture often lives on when the religion that has informed it has dissipated its creative vitality. This happens again and again, as in ancient Egypt, in India and in the humanist sequel to medieval Christendom.

Christopher Dawson introduces his final chapter on *Religion and Cultural Change* with these words: "Every social culture is at once a material way of life and a spiritual order. Culture as a common way of life is inseparable from culture as a common tradition of language and thought and a common inheritance of knowledge; this in turn involves an organized attempt to co-ordinate human action with the transcendent divine power which rules the world and on which man's life depends."

Mr Dawson's book is really a whole history of the connexions of religion and culture. It is a fine example of a Catholic's understanding of the world's religions—it ranges from the Shamanism of the Esquimo, the Pueblo cults of Central America, to the higher religions of Islam, India, China, and the West. I would say that these Gifford Lectures establish two general truths. One, that every school of natural theology—and modern secular humanism is one of these—is preceded by a revealed theology and in most cases derives from it. It follows that if it gets too far away from its supernatural origin it will cease to be human and natural.

The second main conclusion is that religions have to combine two ways to God—or two worlds: the outer way by understanding the universe and man by the mind, the other, the inner way, by penetration of the spiritual world through the depths of the soul. Otherwise, if religion is not full enough to combine these two, we shall have, in Mr Dawson's own words, "on the one side a world full of religious richness and depth but incapable of rational demonstration; on the other, an intelligible order without spiritual depth or direct contact with religious truth." And the consequence for our own day is, as he says, "that the world of reason has become more and more arid and spiritually void, and the world of the soul has lost the consecrated ways by which it expresses itself in the world of culture and has been left at the mercy of the powers of darkness." The book tells how these two ways have been kept together by the prophets and the diviners, by the priesthoods and their sacrificial orders, by the

anointed kings, the lawgivers, and the custodians of sacred science. There is a passage here where Dawson is describing the way to God through spiritual penetration, which is worth transcribing as a warning against the muddle of identifying the inner life or mystical gift or religious experience with revealed religion or faith:

> "Religion has its origin in the depths of the soul, and it can be understood only by those who are prepared to take the plunge. It may be as Jacobi said a *salto mortale*, but it is not as he supposed, a leap from knowledge to faith. That is the basic fallacy of the Natural Theology of the Enlightenment. The difference between the discursive reason and the intuition of the contemplative is not the same as the difference between the natural and the supernatural (in the technical theological sense of the words)—between reason and faith; it is simply a question of the different levels of consciousness which are equally parts of human nature. And the identification of human nature with its extraverted rational aspects confuses and prejudices the whole approach to the study of religion."

Another main contribution of the book is the way in which Dawson assimilates the modern secular revolutionary, the political system and its laws, and the man of science to their spiritual ancestors in the great religious traditions.

Here are a few examples which he adduces of the influence of religion on cultural changes. The sun god and cult of the dead in Egypt made for a universalist religion and justice; the secularization of Chinese culture produced a form of militarism foreign to Chinese tradition; in Ceylon the jungle has covered up cities because Buddhism in that region discouraged attention to the world order.

It comes to this: no secular law or prophecy or science exists which has not derivative links with divine law, religious prophecy, and sacred science. Western ideas are perishing because Western techniques are displacing them—and these are not a culture at all, something which integrates every side of human life.

Religion and Culture is one of those seminal books that will repay renewed study every few years, especially to a reader who, between times, is making the acquaintance of the great religious systems, texts, and rituals of the world. I have had clarified for me at least three things I had dimly guessed at. I knew there must be a third position for a Christian teacher to take up towards the non-Christian religions—the other two being "the evolution of religion" dogma of the early century and the theologically negative attitude of the school represented at its best by Dr Kraemer. Dawson identifies what we may now call, without indecency, the essence of religions (always with an *s*, please) not a distilled extract but a common pattern of cult and culture. This book has also told me what is wrong with much of our modern church life—which nevertheless amazingly goes on. It is an over-cerebrated, verbose, and moralistic epigonus deriving at several removes from the vast sacrificial, priestly, cultural and sacred system of the past. The book also helped me to see how it is that the most active forms of secularism to-day are propelled by a religious and often superstitious impulse, a *soi-disant* social science disguising a naïve faith.

I would epitomize this wisest of books by a quotation from it: "Although the order of religion transcends the order of culture, every culture becomes religious in so far as it recognizes its dependence on the higher order and seeks to bring the social order into conformity with the divine law." To add my own paraphrase: Religion and culture cannot be separated; but neither are they identical. Put positively, a religion in order to flourish must be embodied in a culture, and a culture can survive only for a time when its representatives cease to be devoted to the divine realities which lie behind all cultures. On the other hand, a religion will be debased and ossified if it is just another name for a culture—even of that of a respectable and leading people—and the culture will suffer if it has not a spiritual order to cross swords with inside its own territory.

V. A. Demant.

The Unction of the Sick in the Western Church

It is unnecessary to say that the anointing of the sick with oil for their healing can be traced back to the custom of the primitive Church. There is no reason to doubt that St James states the normal procedure among Christians when he says, "Is any among you sick? Let him call for the elders of the Church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord: and the prayer of faith shall save him that is sick, and the Lord shall raise him up: and if he have committed sins, it shall be forgiven him" (James v, 14, 15). We may indeed go further back still, for it must have been at our Lord's own bidding that the Twelve in their first mission "anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them" (Mark vi, 13).

The subsequent history of the use of Unction, though uniform in the first thousand years, shows a growing divergence between the Eastern and the Western Church in both the theology and the practice of it. Its use in the East has extended more and more widely, the oil being a means of blessing to those in health, as well as a means of healing for those sick in body or mind. In the Western Church, on the contrary, there has been a narrowing of the sacrament until, by an ignoring of the oneness of soul and body, it became the sacrament not of healing but of death, as the final preparation for it in a last purging of the soul for its passing.

In the Anglican Church, the earlier use, as of avail for body as well as soul, was restored in the First Prayer Book, but did not find a place in later revisions. It is only in this century that our bishops and priests have made any considerable resort to this earlier use. Now most of our diocesan bishops are prepared to bless oil for the use of their clergy. But the demands of the faithful laity are sometimes hard to satisfy, owing either to the hostility of their parish priest to the practice of Unction or to his ignorance of how to use it.

And on the one hand there are some who hesitate to use a sacrament in a way different from that of the Roman Church, while on the other hand there are many who regard the sacramental oil as a part of a "corrupt following of the apostles," perhaps forgetting that the other lesser sacraments, including Holy Orders, are in the same category.

It is not known to all that a desire for a return to the earlier use of Unction for the healing of the sick is taking place within the Roman Communion, which is following in the wake of the Anglican Communion in this revival, in the same way as in the encouragement of frequency of Communion. Bodily healing, as one of the possible but subsidiary effects of Unction, finds a place in Roman manuals of to-day. But the object of this article is to draw attention to a conference held at Vanves in April, 1948, on *La Liturgie des Malades*, and reported verbatim in the issue for the October quarter of *La Maison-Dieu*. It was attended by nearly 150 French and Belgian priests, together with the bishops of Chartres and Laval, and a few other people representing such interests as religious periodicals and nursing sisterhoods. The subject was considered under four headings—the visiting of the sick, the sacrament of the sick, the Viaticum, and the death of the Christian. It is with the second of these that this article is concerned, reported on pp. 91-116. But first the relevant "findings" of the Conference must be stated, and it is significant of its unanimity that the eight resolutions concerning Unction follow naturally from the paper read by Dom Bernard Botte, O.S.B., and from the discussion to which it led.

1. Extreme Unction (as the texts and prayers of the Ritual testify) is a remedy not only for the soul but the body (*cœlestis medicina, non animæ solum sed etiam corpori salutaris*). It is not the sacrament of the last moment of life.

2. As far as bodily health is concerned, it does not act as a miracle which stays a corpse at the moment of death, but *per modum medicinæ*, when the sick person is still capable of being nursed and healed. That is why it is to be wished that the faulty and comparatively recent title of Extreme Unction should be given up, in order to return to the traditional expression "the Unction of the Sick."

3. The Unction of the Sick is not the sacrament of the last agony, which completes the sanctifying action of the Church. The *Viaticum* is the final strengthening of the dying and the pledge of resurrection. That is why it is to be wished that, as in the ancient Ritual, the Unction of the Sick should be administered before giving the *Viaticum*.

4. It is to be wished that the shepherds of souls should make a very wide use of this sacrament conformable both with the directions of the Church and the sense of the prayers.

5. This sacrament is contained within the framework of the *Liturgie des Malades*, which fact can and should help in the preparation indispensable for the sacrament.

6. It is a fact that instruction in this sacrament has been too much neglected in preaching and also in the teaching of the seminaries. This is one of the reasons why it is sometimes so difficult to administer it.

It is therefore important to say and to repeat, in instruction and in preaching, that this sacrament is that of the sick, that it can heal, that it ought to be received well before they come to their last moment, that it is a grace of the Saviour and ought to be received with joy, and that it must be asked for and not dreaded.

The attention of the faithful is to be drawn to the oil for the sick. An occasion should be found for making use of Maundy Thursday for letting the faithful know that on that day the bishop in his Cathedral, in the course of the Mass, blesses the oil which is to serve for the anointing of the sick through the year.

7. The Ritual requires that the oil for the sick should be kept in a seemly place and surrounded with respect. If these requirements were better observed it would be possible to present this oil for the veneration of the faithful as, for example, at the time of preaching about the sacrament of the sick.

8. Grave and difficult pastoral problems are presented by sick folk who are scarcely Christian and by their families. It is impossible to regulate all these problems *a priori*. One should always endeavour to explain the rites, and to translate the prayers wherever it is possible.

One should equally remember that the sacrament of the sick is not a magical rite any more than the other sacraments. It presupposes not only that it should be accepted but also that it should be desired. It forms part of the worship given to God.

These conclusions are sufficiently interesting in themselves, but the thoughts that inspired them are expanded in Dom Botte's paper. The conclusions are best left to speak for themselves, but a few words of comment are perhaps excusable in summarizing some of the arguments contained in the paper.

He begins by explaining that manuals of theology are superficial in their treatment of this sacrament, and then he faces the question whether it is for the dying, to prepare the soul to appear before God, or to help the sick man towards healing. If the former, then the prayers for healing contained in the Office will have become a farce by the time it is administered. He speaks of these as alternatives, which no manuals explain, but "are like one who asks you to sit down between two chairs."

Here it is pertinent to raise the question, Why treat these two things as alternatives? Why introduce an either-or? Why thus separate the soul and the body in considering the effects of Unction? Advances in psychology have taught us that, although man may be regarded as made up of component parts (which the Christian psychology would describe as body, mind, and spirit, or body and soul, the latter including both mind and spirit), these so-called divisions are not really separate, and all interact upon one another. Hence it may be said that in the sacrament of healing it need not be asked whether it affects the soul *or* the body, if it is considered as entering the complex human personality by way of the spirit, on which its effect is certain, and penetrating to the mind or body or both. The Anglican formula now in use, based upon that of the Prayer Book of 1549, seems automatically to solve the problem: "Almighty God grant thee of His infinite goodness that thy soul inwardly may be anointed with the Holy Ghost, who is the Spirit of all strength, comfort, relief, and gladness: *and* vouchsafe for His great mercy (if it be His blessed will) to restore unto thee thy bodily health and strength, to serve Him, and send thee release of all thy pains, troubles, and diseases, both in body and mind."

Dom Botte proceeds to consider Unction from three points of view—the liturgical, the theological, and the pastoral.

1. On the liturgical side, he divides its history into two period Up to the eighth or ninth centuries the only existing testimony that of the formulas for the blessing of the oil, which lay stress upo bodily effect—namely, the healing of the sick. But two restrictio on its use are indicated in certain historical records, such as a lett of Innocent I, first that the oil should be blessed by a bishop, an secondly that the recipient should be a member of the Church an in communion with her.

In the second period, beginning with the ninth century, doc ments abound. In the formulas of administration, the words (wit slight variations) are *Ungo te in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritu Sancti ut oratio fidei salvet te et alleviet te Dominus.* His commen is that the words are inspired by the words of St James, and seem to imply the healing of the sick person .As for the prayers whic follow the anointing, though these also differ, "we establish the fa that here the Church always prays for the recovery of the sic person." But there is an increasing tendency to lay less stress on th bodily effect and more on the spiritual. For example, the Magdale College Pontifical of the twelfth century substitutes for the praye for healing, *Ut peccatorum suorum veniam consequi et ad vita æternam pervenire mereatur.*

2. From the theological point of view, there is the difficulty tha because Unction is a sacrament, though certainly medicinal, it mus be a *medicina spiritualis*, and "the chief effect cannot be the hea ing of the body, because the effect of a sacrament is a grace. Theology is therefore directed towards the spiritualization of Unc tion, but theologians have not avoided "the dangers of slipping int abstract speculation about it which is out of touch with the livin tradition of the Church." Some, such as Hugo of St Victor, admitte a double efficacy, remission of sins and relief of physical infirmity others added a third effect, "certain spiritual blessings not othe wise defined." Others distinguished between the Unction, which wa for the remission of sins, and the prayer of the priest which aske for healing. So the bodily effect tended to be forgotten, though no denied.

The belief that Unction conferred *status*, on the analogy of th other sacraments in which it was used (Baptism and Confirmation) had two results. It thus became questionable whether it could b repeated, and it also suggested certain interdictions, such as the fo bidding of marriage to one who had been anointed. Such theorie naturally contributed towards reserving Unction for the dying.

Dom Botte suggests that the title *Unctio Extrema*, which onl appeared in the twelfth century, was due to these tendencies. Bu surely a better explanation is that it was so called as the *last* of th three sacramental Unctions, in Baptism, in Confirmation, and fo the sick.

By the time of the Council of Trent it was becoming solely sacrament for the dying. But whereas the first suggestion of tha Council limited its effect to the soul of the dying, the final state ment added *Et sanitatem corporis interdum, ubi saluti animæ ex*

pedierit, consequitur. On this Dom Botte comments, "It will therefore be seen that the Council of Trent deliberately avoided limiting it to merely a sacrament of the dying; it thus avoided the tendency of the theologians so to restrict it."

3. From the pastoral point of view the practical question is, To what sick folk is Unction to be administered? Such problems were dealt with more fully in the discussion which followed, where it was pointed out that, if the priest is called in only at the last minute, it is incongruous to use the prayers for healing. If he does use them, does it not imply that he was called too late? People had lost their faith through such administration, but the sacrament is meant to be a witness of the Church to others, as well as for the patient. In facing the question whether one could refuse Unction, it was suggested that if the family refuses it for fear of frightening the patient, it should not be given if the patient also refuses. If he is himself ready, it must not be refused. It has to be given in hospital when the conditions are sometimes hostile. Another priest said he never hesitated to give Unction at once to a sick man, and spoke of a case when he said to the sufferer, "This will heal you," and after three days the patient left his bed.

Finally, Dom Botte set forth some "conclusions and views," which need not be particularized here, as they are represented in the eight findings of the Conference. He concluded with these words: "It is not that Unction is a magical remedy which ought infallibly to produce healing. But since we believe in the efficacy of prayer . . . for the healing of the sick person, is it not natural that in this spirit we should fulfil a rite which goes back to the Church of the Apostles and was instituted for that purpose? That we may arrive at an intelligent and fruitful practice for our own apostolate, we must give our young priests a theology of Unction which is genuinely traditional and is not complicated by contradictions which certain theological speculations have introduced without any support from the living tradition of the Church. Let us give to Unction its true face (*physionomie*) as the sacrament of the sick and no longer the sacrament of the last agony, and let us not make any longer a sort of halting between contradictory opinions."

In the discussion which followed, testimony was given to the physical effect of Unction, and doctors were quoted as saying that Unction received by the sick who believed in it with knowledge of its purpose "modified completely the state of the sick." Priests and nurses spoke to the same effect.

It will be seen from these records of the Conference that a movement has begun in the Roman Communion which is likely to be of growing importance and extent. We of the Anglican Communion also claim to be part of the Western Church. And with regard to ourselves it may be noted that in 1549 an official return to the practice and attitude of the early Church was made by the restoration of Unction as the sacrament of healing in the Office of the Visitation of the Sick. This should not pass unnoticed in this year of the quater-centenary of the Book of Common Prayer. In this relation it

is difficult to give thanks likewise for subsequent revisions of the Book, of which the first omitted it and the others failed to reinsert it. With regard to the 1928 Book it was unfortunately a few years too early for an official recognition to be given to what had already come back into use by both priests and bishops. At least an optional use of the laying on of hands for healing was inserted in 1928. It was in 1934 that a form for the use of Unction (restoring the attitude and language of 1549) was accepted by the Convocation of Canterbury and subsequently by that of York.

But as early as 1915 the Guild of St Raphael was formed for the encouragement of the Church's Ministry of Healing through prayer and the sacraments. It stated as among its objects "To restore the use of the Sacrament of Holy Unction and the rite of Laying on of Hands for healing"; and it is significant that after twenty years it was able to alter the words "restore the use of" into "make use of." There are other healing guilds with which it works in co-operation, and the wider Churches' Council of Healing is meant to bind them together; but it remains the only exclusively Anglican Guild, which is thus able to lay full stress on sacramental means of healing.

In three respects the Anglican Church has gone a long way further than the Roman in thought as well as in practice.

In the first place nothing seems to have been said at Vanves about active co-operation between priests and doctors, through recognition that all forms of healing are of God. One of the primary objects with which Archbishop Temple brought the Churches' Council of Healing into being was to bring clergy and doctors together as colleagues in the healing of the sick in body or mind. An important part of the Council is its medical sub-committee. The Working Committee usually meets in doctors' consulting rooms in Harley Street. Every priest of the Guild of St Raphael has promised "to seek, wherever possible, the co-operation of doctors and nurses."

In the second place nothing seems to have been said at Vanves about the use of the sacrament of healing for anything but the healing of the body. But surely the healing of the *mind* must not be forgotten, and the Anglican formula of Unction expressly mentions release from all "pains, troubles, and diseases, both in body and mind." Many priests have had the same experience as the present writer, who happens to have been often called on to administer Unction to those not in bodily but in mental sickness, with the most blessed results. And, but for a few exceptional cases, the confession and absolution which has preceded Unction has been a real part of the healing.

This leads to the third point which was not dealt with at Vanves —namely, the relation of the sacrament of Unction to that of Penance. It is true that Dom Botte mentioned, as a theological speculation, that as Baptism and Penance respectively brought pardon for original sin and for mortal sin, so Unction was for remission of venial sins. But the Anglican stress has been upon Absolution as the regular ministry preceding Unction, to be used in close conjunction with it. This connexion leads us back to the

primitive Church and the words of St James, where, linked with the statement that if the sick man anointed with oil "have committed sins, it shall be forgiven him," comes the charge, "Confess *therefore* your sins one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed" (v. 16).

T. W. Crafer.

The Origin of the Decalogue

The Editor, in his articles of December, 1943, and February, 1945, set forth the continuing need of prohibitions to restrain a sinful generation and the importance of the Decalogue in linking duty towards one's fellow men with duty towards God; it is significant that the abandonment of the practice of reciting it and its removal from our altars have coincided with a collapse of moral standards. He could deal only briefly with the critical problems. Now that we discriminate between the different parts of the Bible in respect of the authority they have for conscience, on what grounds do we ascribe special honour to the Decalogue? Some of our forefathers would have replied: Because it is the authentic voice of God that sounded on Sinai. Others would have pointed to its republication by Christ in the Gospels, where, however, only the second table is quoted. But what grounds have we for associating the Ten Commandments in their present form with the Covenant given on the Mount?

The Book of the Covenant (Ex. xx, 23 to xxiii, 19) is held to have been taken from the E document of the Northern Kingdom, which, if it is rightly dated about 750, is contemporary with the preaching of Amos. The Decalogue precedes the Code, from which it is sharply distinguished: it is the direct voice of God, the Code is God's command spoken through Moses. It, like the Code, is generally supposed to have come from E, in which, however, it was an independent unit. As it stands it shows unmistakable signs of having been revised by editors of the Deuteronomy school, witness the amplifications of the second and fifth Commandments; a further revision has taken place later, for in the fourth we have a reference to the Creation narrative of Gen. i (the Priestly Code).

The original Decalogue was doubtless very concise, in order to be memorized by simple people who would use the fingers of their two hands. It would run probably like this:

1. Thou shalt have none other gods before me. (In Yahweh sanctuaries no rivals are permitted.)

2. Thou shalt not make unto thee a graven image (*i.e.*, either of Yahweh or of any other god, a great advance on the standards of an earlier time, as illustrated by Judges xviii, 14 and by the frequent references to the teraphim, "household gods").

3. Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain (*i.e.*, swear by Yahweh and fail to observe thy oath).

4. Remember the sabbath day to keep it holy. (In the time of the

monarchy the Sabbath [full moon?] and the New Moon went together. The superior importance of the former now begins to be recognized.)

5. Honour thy father and mother.

6-9. (As in the familiar version.)

10. Thou shalt not covet (implying taking practical steps to realize the wish; so Mark x, 19, where it is quoted in the form "do not defraud").

There is another Decalogue in Ex. xxxiv, 19-26, which comes from the J document of the Southern Kingdom, probably 100 years earlier than E. Moses writes the laws a second time in this form they arise out of the Covenant, see verse 27: "after the tenor of these words I have made a covenant with thee and with Israel." They can easily be arranged as Ten Commandments, though there is an element of doubt in the division. We omit the editorial amplifications, which were probably made after the J and E documents were fused into JE.

1. Thou shalt worship no other god.

2. Thou shalt make thee no molten gods.

3. The feast of unleavened bread shalt thou keep. Seven days shalt thou eat unleavened bread.

4. All that openeth the womb is mine . . . all the first-born of thy sons shalt thou redeem. And none shall appear before me empty.

5. Six days thou shalt work . . . thou shalt rest (perhaps modified in JE to suit contemporary practice).

6. Thou shalt observe the feast of weeks, etc.

7. Thou shalt not offer the blood of my sacrifice with leavened bread.

8. Neither shall the sacrifice of the passover be left unto the morning.

9. The first of the first fruits of thy ground thou shalt bring unto the house of the Lord thy God.

10. Thou shalt not seethe a kid in its mother's milk (the concluding words of the Book of the Covenant).

When we have two versions of the same incident in the Pentateuch we explain them by the hypothesis of two documents. We note that the J version coincides with the E version in 1, 2, and 5. Otherwise it is concerned solely with matters of ritual. It is hard to see why the Northern Kingdom should have been so far ahead of the Southern, so we conclude that the original of the E version resembled J, and in its present form it shows the moralizing of religion under the influence of the prophets.

The Deuteronomy version of the Decalogue (verses 7-21) closely resembles that of Exodus xx, as we should expect if the latter was revised by the Deuteronomists; it slightly emphasizes the Sabbath and social duties. That a document is quoted is clear from the fact that the verbs of the Decalogue are in the second personal singular those of the context being in the plural. There is no trace of the P influence found in Ex. xx, so in its present form the Deuteronomy version is the earlier.

The device of Ten Commandments seems to be followed in Ezek. xviii, 5-10, where the requirements may be arranged thus:

(1) Justice; (2) not eating on the mountains (*i.e.*, idolatrous high places); (3) eschewing idolatry, and (4) adultery, and (5) approaching a woman in her separation; (6) not wronging others; (7) avoiding violence; (8) feeding the hungry and clothing the naked; (9) not engaging in usury; (10) withdrawing the hand from iniquity. Here we have a mixture of ritual and moral requirements, going back to the priestly traditions of Jerusalem (cf. the Code of Holiness, Lev. xvii-xxvi) and to the positive teaching of the prophets.

It is an attractive suggestion that the Decalogue's original purpose was to be a test of non-Israelites, Canaanites, and others who were being assimilated to the Hebrews, before they were admitted to the sanctuaries of Yahweh; if so, it would naturally circulate in different versions. The theory is supported by Ps. xv, which contains ten conditions for entry into the sanctuary: (1) To walk uprightly; (2) speak truth; (3) avoid slander, etc. Actually in verse 5 we have the prohibition of usury in the ninth place as in Ezekiel. No such catechism would ever have been imposed on converts, but the pious Jew uses the familiar form to construct for himself a test of moral fitness.

Such is a critical view of the problem. There is no generally accepted view; indeed, some scholars revert to the Mosaic origin of the Decalogue. This falls into line with the renewed emphasis on the necessity of finding a great personality as the inaugurator of Hebrew religion and the recognition that the monarchy in both Kingdoms witnessed apostasy from an earlier and purer age, to which the prophets appealed. This need not be disputed, but the Tables remain obscure. The passages which mention them (Ex. xxiv, 12; xxxi, 18; xxxii, 15, 16; xxxiv, 28) never state unambiguously what was written on them. There is no evidence from the prophetic books to show that the Decalogue was known (passages like Jer. vii, 23 and Hos. viii, 12, which are quoted, prove nothing).

It is best therefore to take the Decalogue as the finest part of the Torah, God's continuing instruction of His people, which is all the more impressive because it bears the marks of successive ages and their documents, and not to claim for it an antiquity that cannot be proved.

We have already referred to our Lord's quotation of the Decalogue (see Matt. xix, 18 and Luke xviii, 10; in Mark x, 19 the words are spoken by the young man and tacitly endorsed by Jesus). Matthew adds "thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself" as a summary of the second Table, as does Paul in Rom. xiii, 9.

By contemporary Judaism the Decalogue was held in great honour, being recited daily in the Temple, and later in the synagogues. See *Tamid* v, 1 (*The Mishnah*, ed. Danby): "They recited a Benediction, and recited the Ten Commandments, the Shema', etc." In the Nash papyrus the Shema' ("Hear, O Israel . . .") and Decalogue are associated, the latter agreeing with Ex. xx in the main but with Deuteronomy in the tenth Commandment. The Talmuds say that the Ten Words should be recited every day, but because of the

heretics are not, "lest they should say, These only were given t Moses on Sinai," from which we learn that the prominence given b the Christians to the Decalogue caused its liturgical disuse amon the Jews.

What bearing has this brief historical sketch on our liturgica problem? The purpose of the compilers of the Prayer Book in pr fixing the Commandments to the Communion Service was to provid a God-given form of self-examination for communicants. The Ex hortation makes this clear. "The way and means thereto [*i.e.*, t worthy reception] is, first, to examine your lives and conversation *by the rule of God's* commandments." The manuals on which th older of us were brought up recognize this and provide full lists o questions covering positive virtues as well as prohibitions, followin the lead of our Lord's "fulfilment" in the Sermon on the Mount. Bu the allocation under the different heads is often arbitrary, and man find the Beatitudes (1 Cor. xiii, or Rom. xiii) more satisfactory as basis for self-examination, to say nothing of the two Duties in th Catechism, just as the author of Ps. xv composed his own Decalogu for his devotional needs. The root difficulty of the Ten Commandments is that so much has to be explained as not to be taken liter ally. Those who come to Communion to-day are unlikely often t be guilty of breaking them in the literal sense, and in the interes of reality an alternative has to be provided. Nor would putting the above the altar have any effect on the great majority that does no come to church. It seems that no better solution can be suggeste than that of the 1928 Prayer Book, to recite them occasionally, i order to keep the link with the past, and that in the abbreviate form which is nearer to the original Decalogue than is the familia form.

W. K. Lowther Clarke.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Dr Demant is Canon and Treasurer of St Paul's Cathedral.
Dr Crafer is the author of *Christ's Healing Miracles*, etc.
Dr Lowther Clarke is a Canon of Chichester Cathedral.

CORRESPONDENCE

NEW TRANSLATION OF THE BIBLE

To the Editor of Theology.

Sir,

In Dr Hendry's interesting presentation of the scheme for new translation of the Bible there are several sentences which invit inspection.

Dr Hendry says: "it cannot be gainsaid that to those of ou

people who have not had more than elementary schooling in language and literature there is much in the A.V. which is quite unintelligible." This is no doubt true: some of "our people" may even be baffled by Dr Hendry's verb *gainsay*. But the prospect of a translation of the Bible to be made intelligible to persons of rudimentary education is somewhat disturbing. There is much in Professor Kemp-Smith's translation of Kant's *Critique* which is unintelligible to such persons; but I do not think that a new translation of Kant, for elementary schools, is called for. We must remember that there are several kinds of unintelligibility. There may be the mistranslation; there may be the archaic word or phrase which now conveys either the wrong meaning or none at all; there may be the word which baffles uneducated persons because the current use differs (*e.g., prevent*); finally there is the difficulty or profundity of the meaning. To make a more intelligible translation should mean to make a translation which can be understood by those capable of understanding; it should not mean, but might easily slip into meaning, to make a translation which is *easy* to understand. For there is a great deal in the Bible which can never be made easy except by evacuation of content. It is, in fact, a very difficult book. One would like to be assured that translators, inspired by the admirable aim of making the Bible intelligible, are quite clear in their minds about the meaning of intelligibility.

Dr Hendry says that "the Church's task is not to promote literary appreciation but to proclaim the Word of God": an assertion which appears to command unquestioning assent. But if we substitute, for the slightly deprecatory phrase "promote literary appreciation" another phrase: "preserve the purity, precision, and dignity of the English language," it is a statement over which we must ponder. If and when a superior style obstructs the presentation of the Word of God, then we must agree that the Word of God has precedence. But there is a difference between asserting a precedence and asserting that the Church has *no* responsibility towards the English language —which is what Dr Hendry's words might easily be taken to mean. If the Church re-writes its Bible and its liturgies to conform with every successive stage of deterioration of the language, the prospect is gloomy. For the speech of " our people" is not only "threadbare," but incapable of expressing exact and subtle thought. Dr Hendry's assertion might also be enlarged to cover the whole of ecclesiastical art—*e.g.*, "the Church's task is not to promote the appreciation of stained-glass windows, but to proclaim the Word of God"—so let us have no more stained-glass windows.

Finally, Dr Hendry attempts to anticipate a possible objection by Anglicans: the objection that "a new translation in modern English, if read in church, would jar with the language of the Prayer Book." He proceeds to say:

> On this matter it may be permitted to a non-Anglican (apart from suggesting the obvious remedy) to remark that he has listened to many sermons in Anglican churches the language of which was very far removed from that of the Book of Common Prayer and no offence has been taken.

Dr Hendry appears to hesitate to suggest the "obvious remedy"; perhaps other readers will infer, as I have done, that his obvious remedy is that we should re-write the Book of Common Prayer. But his remark that he has heard many sermons preached in language very far removed from that of the Book of Common Prayer (and in my experience I have heard very few sermons that were *not* in language very far removed from that of the Book of Common Prayer) seems to me to have no relevance.

By all means let us have a new translation; let us have several translations. Anyone who is studying the Bible with care should examine every translation available that has merit. I have myself profited from reading the Warre-Cornish translation of several Epistles; for the A.V. Epistles are, like Hamlet, so crammed with quotations that the author's thought is obscured. But let us remember that no translation of anything is more than a *substitute*; and let us consider the possibility of employing one translation for one purpose and another for another.

Your obedient servant,

T. S. Eliot.

June 20, 1949.

THE MINISTRY

To the Editor of Theology.

Sir,

Whatever Dr Sykes's motives, they are sure to be worthy of a clergyman and a scholar. It is because I sincerely believe this that I am puzzled by the position he has taken up, but I must ask his pardon for writing "motives" where "reasons" was the right word.

Since he courteously leaves me to decide, we will keep Convocation matters for Convocation. Questions based on part of one sentence from a long speech are not always a useful basis for historical discussion. If he will raise the matter before those who heard the speech, I will try to satisfy him.

I made no attempt to assess the weight of names on either side in the seventeenth century, but merely indicated by illustrations that when Dr Sykes writes of "the seventeenth-century divines" without qualification and Dr Bell calls one side "*The* Anglican Position," they are over-calling their hand appreciably. A *catena* which quotes Davenant and Gunning on one side but omits mention of men of the stature of Pearson and Beveridge on the other; which treats as typical Cosin's communion at Charenton but is silent as to the censures of his colleagues, the protests of his congregation, and the deliberate discountenance of the king and government; which cites Wake repeatedly but does not mention his contemporary and successor Potter—this hardly commends itself at first sight as a balanced presentation of the evidence available.

I cited the warning of the Prussian Ambassador Bonnet to his

government in 1711 that the majority of the English clergy held the more consistent view of episcopacy. Dr Sykes prefers to accept the statements of Wake that he disagreed with *quibusdam furiosis scriptoribus* in England, who thought foreign Protestant orders null, and also that Wake's own view was shared by *omnes saniores symmystæ* —because, Dr Sykes thinks, "the primate was more likely to be well informed." Wake was not primate in 1711, but he wrote thus in 1719. *Furiosus* seems an odd word to apply to the moderate Waterland and the serious William Law, who had published opinions contrary to Wake's in 1713 and 1718. Perhaps he was biased in his criterion of "sanity." But there is nothing in this evidence to suggest that Wake was not in a minority—which is what Bonnet said.

Bonnet's evidence does not stand alone. The Prussian Government was disturbed by his information, and the Minister of Public Worship, Baron von Printzen, wrote at once to Jablonski, the chief Prussian ecclesiastical negotiator, about the difficulties episcopacy must raise in the Prussian Church. Jablonski, an enthusiast for unity but a wise and candid man, saw the danger to the success of the negotiations, but replied to Printzen: *"Mr Bonnet expose avec beaucoup de fidélité l'opinion de l'Eglise Anglicane touchant le gouvernement Episcopale."* (Muysson, *Relation, etc.* London, 1757, p. 75.) He had every reason to question this if he was not certain it was true. But he had spent years in England, he had corresponded at length with Grabe on this point, and had recently discussed it at Berlin with Lord Raby, the English Ambassador, and his chaplain Averst—so he knew the facts. It was on this question that the Anglo-Prussian negotiations halted. But the documents—some unpublished —indicate that the British government never intended these Berlin negotiations to get far. Their real objective was the incoming dynasty in Hanover, whither the whole question was soon transferred. There, too, English Episcopalianism proved a stumbling block. The course of events between the English and Hanoverian Churches after 1714 underlines Bonnet's prescience in 1711. If Wake's views on foreign orders were acceptable to Anglicans at large, why, after his own elevation to the Primacy and the personal union of the States, was he never able to secure official Anglican recognition of the Hanoverian Church? What was the point of the later Anglican insistence on sending the "Hanover Chaplains" with the monarch whenever he crossed to his German domains? Dr Sykes probably knows more about Wake than anyone since 1737. He would increase our debt to him by explaining these points.

The use of Comber and Wheatly in the professional training of the clergy is attested by the immense numbers of citations from them, not only by scholars but in lesser works and pamphlets in the eighteenth century. Wheatly's *Illustration* went through at least twenty-two editions before 1754; Comber's much larger work was still being published in abbreviated editions in 1758, 1762, and 1768. There are details of its being provided in parish churches in his own lifetime in the *Memoirs of Thomas Comber* by his grandson (London, 1799. I have not the volume by me for reference).

Both authors are still among the "authorized writers" for Mant in 1820.

I fear I must dissent from Dr Sykes' estimate of Comber's theology of Orders. The passage I cited continues:

> "But du Plessis saith they in France might have had the assistance of some bishops who favoured the Reformation, and they would not, and some of them grew so enamoured of their new way as to reordain those who were episcopally ordained; which shows it was choice in some, so that this plea cannot be urged by them . . . wherefore if any of them despise episcopal ordination or eject them who are so ordained as is done in Scotland they have no excuse and I judge their orders to be null and void" (*Companion to the Temple*. 4th ed., 1702, ii, p. 190).

Here and elsewhere Comber, like Jeremy Taylor, takes the plea of "necessity" seriously, and virtually rejects it because it breaks down on the facts. This is not the conclusion of Cosin and some others cited by Dr Sykes and Dr Bell about the Huguenots, though Comber's was the common attitude of Anglicans towards them in practice (cf., *e.g.*, R. Watson, *The Rt Rev. Dr J. Cosin . . . His Opinion . . . for Communicating rather with Geneva than Rome*. London, 1684, p. 7). Lord Scudamore, King Charles's Ambassador in Paris, "was careful to publish upon all occasions . . . 'that the Church of England looked not on the Hugonots as a part of their communion'" (Clarendon, *History, etc.*, ii, p. 74), and he must have known the official position. Even Bramhall, whatever he wrote in the heat of Irish controversies, seems to have abstained from communion with them when it became a practical possibility during his twelve years of exile.

The truth is that the seventeenth-century Anglicans were in a dilemma of conscience, between their theology of episcopacy and their no less sincerely held "regalism," which was the very foundation of their conception of the Church. They were therefore always tempted to seek some expedient by which (what they held for) a Divine law might be held dispensed in the case of potential allies of the Stuart crown and church against the English republicans and dissenters. It was stated plainly by Thorndike: "I must not take upon me either to justify or to condemn their ordinations, averring on the one side that they are not according to rule, seeing on the other side that they are owned by my superiors" (*Works*, V, p. 430). It is necessary to examine somewhat closely the embarrassed language in which they put forward the plea that foreign churches acted under "necessity" in dispensing with episcopacy and therefore God will excuse them, before one can come at their real opinions, which varied. The attitude of some—perhaps the majority—but not all, amounts to a profession of agnosticism rather than acceptance. I do not think Dr Sykes or Dr Bell has made the considerable differences in the presentation of this doctrine of "necessity"—in itself so imprecise—at all clear. Sometimes, indeed, it leads some Carolines into something painfully like humbug. Cosin, for instance, in the letter partially cited by both Dr Sykes and Dr Bell, in defence of his actions at Charenton, pleads this "necessity" for the Huguenots, and

admits that they reordain those episcopally ordained before they allow them to minister. (Though individuals were friendly to Anglicanism, their church officially styled and treated all episcopal ordinations as "anti-Christian.") But Cosin's real reasons come out in a passage not cited by Dr Sykes:

> "If upon this ground [of nullity of orders] we renounce the French, we must for the very same reason renounce all the ministers of Germany . . . and then what will become of the Protestant party?"[1] (*Works*, IV, p. 405.)

It was the emergence of Whig *bishops* after 1688 and their rise to ascendancy that eventually delivered Anglicanism from this dilemma between theology and politics, which seventeenth-century bishops had found insoluble and often agonizing. It altered the whole relation of the Church to the Crown from what Cranmer and the Elizabethans had made of it. The maintenance first of the Establishment and then (in the nineteenth century) of the Church as a Divine Society in its own right, and not of the Royal Prerogative, becomes the rallying-point of Anglicanism. In the upshot, modern Anglicanism owes far more to the period of Queen Anne and George I and less to the Carolines, than the Tractarians imagined.

In speaking of "contemporary scholars" and "works of the time," *c.* 1710, one means, I suppose, men writing and books published ten or fifteen years before or after. That would cover Beveridge, Comber, Wheatly, Potter (whose *Discourse* was published in 1703, though he did not become Archbishop till 1737), Waterland, and Law on the one side, with a number of lesser men like Roberts, Symson, Archdeacon Hill, Bisse, and others, now long forgotten but read in their day; and on the other, Bonnet, Wake, Bingham, with Fleetwood and some lesser writers—but I know not who else of note (for it would be unfair to cite Hoadly, and I do not remember that Gibson wrote on this, though he probably agreed with Wake. Sharp is a special case. The Anglo-Prussian negotiations throw doubt on his real position, and I do not count him on either side, despite his speech on the Occasional Conformity Bill). But it is news to me that Hooker, Whitgift, Andrewes, Bramhall, Thorndike, Taylor, and Ussher were still writing. I did not exclude Pearson from the category of "court bishops," but I must point out that when a man insists that *Ordinandi potestas Solis competit episcopis*, to infer that he rejects non-episcopal orders, is an argument not from silence but from evidence.

I shall not now continue this discussion, but I would like to ask Dr Sykes two questions (in addition to those on Hanover). He seeks to set up as the norm of the Anglican *via media* a view of episcopacy held by some divines in the period "from Whitgift to Wake"—just the period when, as he has indicated, the Anglican doctrine (for such it was) of "regalism" produced a serious problem of conscience be-

[1] By "Protestant party" he means the exiled Anglicans (as opposed to Papists and Dissenters), not "the Lutherans" as Mason suggests.

tween the claims of what they held was an (immediate or mediate) Divine Ordinance and the urgent political necessities of the Church's "Supreme Governor." They found their way out of that problem by the plea of the "necessity" under which foreign Protestants acted. Does Dr Sykes accept as historically founded the theory that the sixteenth and seventeenth century foreign Protestant *Churches* (not individuals) desired Episcopal ordination and only dispensed with it because it was impossible to obtain? That was of the essence of the case for the view which Dr Sykes would bring back. And does he also accept the teaching of the same divines that the validity of ordinations is in some measure conditioned by political allegiance and geography, so that what would excuse foreign Protestants before God in no wise validated the ordinations of English, Scottish, or Irish Dissenters, who could always have had Episcopal ordination had they desired it? This also was put forward as an integral part of this particular view.

I think these are fair questions, because it seems to me (and would have seemed to them) that to return now to their doctrine without holding both these two elements in it would be in effect to abandon that theology of episcopacy which they so passionately defended and to *substitute for* it an expedient which they devised for avoiding political consequences of that theology which no longer exist. What puzzles me about his essay is the combination of historical insight with insensitiveness to these important aspects of their thought. If Dr Sykes would elucidate these points, it would add much to the value of his Essay, and perhaps relieve the bewilderment of some of his friends, among whom, after nearly thirty years of acquaintance off and on, I hope that he counts me one.

I am, Sir,

Your servant *in Dno*,

GREGORY DIX, O.S.B.

NASHDOM ABBEY,
BURNHAM,
BUCKS.
July 9, 1949.

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

I am grateful to you for allowing me to see Dr Dix's further letter and for the opportunity of reply before you close the correspondence. I will try not to abuse the privilege of taking last innings.

I am of course grateful to Dr Dix for the handsome statement about myself with which his letter opens and for the expression of personal friendship with which it closes, both of which I cordially reciprocate.

I take note that Dr Dix prefers to reply to my inquiry about the alleged suspension of Cosin *ab officio* in another place and at another time; and that he says that "questions based on part of one sentence from a long speech are not always a useful basis for historical discussion." I have verified my citation from the Chronicle of the Lower

House of Canterbury Convocation, and cannot find that it was in any way unfair. The full sentence to which Dr Dix refers reads as follows: "In regard to the illustration to which Dr Smethurst had referred, his recollection was that Bishop Cosin, on account of what he did at Charenton, was suspended *ab officio* from his service in the Prince of Wales' chapel in Paris." My citation omitted the words *before* "his recollection." With regard to Dr Dix's preference to answer my questions elsewhere, I shall not myself take the initiative of raising the matter in Convocation, which meets only thrice per year and is much busied with Canon Law revision. I shall be content to await the results of Dr Dix's further exploration of his recollection about Cosin's suspension; and if his investigations should lead him to modify his recollection, he will be able to state this before the Lower Clergy in Convocation. I have asked my questions, and await Dr Dix's choice of time and place to reply.

I observe, however, that in his present letter this suspension *ab officio* has become "the deliberate discountenance of the king and government." Since Dr Dix is not replying to my question now, I need not comment on his further observations on Cosin in his letter; save to observe that I did not commit myself to the statement about "Cosin's communion at Charenton," but only referred to his recommendation of the lawfulness of such communion. I do not consider the evidence sufficiently clear to pronounce whether Cosin himself communicated at Charenton.

On pp. 14-15 of the first edition of my pamphlet (p. 14 of the second), I expressly stated that I did not claim that all the seventeenth-century divines were of one mind or spoke with one voice on the question of foreign Protestant churches and their ministries. On pp. 30-33 of the first edition I explicitly stated also that there was difference of practice amongst seventeenth-century Anglicans on the question of communicating with the foreign Protestant churches when abroad.

With regard to the Anglo-Prussian negotiations of the reign of Queen Anne, the reasons for their breakdown seem to me complex. It was wholly consonant with the position sketched in my pamphlet that it should be made clear in Berlin that the simple adoption of a German version of the Anglican Liturgy, without the adoption also of episcopal ordination henceforth, would not suffice to create a union between Canterbury and Berlin. Jablonski, of course, accepted this position, since he himself in 1699 had received consecration to the Moravian episcopate. There is, however, the unexplained rebuff given to the Prussian advances by Archbishop Tenison, which can hardly be due to a rigid attitude towards episcopacy on his part. In view of the quantity of unpublished materials still to be investigated, as Dr Dix observes (some of which I have in my hands at present), I think it impossible to offer an opinion on the question now. In the case of Wake the amount of unprinted material is much greater; and until I have had the leisure to read all of it, no conjecture which I could offer would be worthy of your space. I hope in the future to deal with Wake on a more considerable scale.

Dr Dix's figures concerning the editions of Comber and Wheatl show that their works were widely read, but I cannot see how the prove that "they were both generally used in the professional trai ing of all the eighteenth-century clergy." Would Dr Dix conclud from the fact that Burnet's *Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articl* went through ten editions during the first half of the nineteent century, that it was then being generally used in the professiona training of all the clergy? Or from the parallel fact that his *Histo of the Reformation* went through twelve editions between 1816 an 1880, including the definitive edition of Pocock, that it was th quasi-official Anglican version of the Reformation?

The question of what constitutes "the official position" is not ea of answer. Dr Dix places his confidence in the Prussian ambassado Bonnet, and in Lord Scudamore as expressing this. Yet when Thorn dike wrote, in a passage cited both by Dr Dix and myself, tha "though I must not take upon me either to justify or to condem their ordinations, averring on the one side that they are not accor ing to rule, seeing on the other side that they are owned by m superiors," it might as legitimately be argued that this owning b his superiors represented "the official position." Moreover, Thorn dike continued in the very same sentence: "yet I must acknowledg that there are very great reasons to hope that God accepteth of the ordinations, though not made according to rule, in consideration the necessity that drove them to it, and of the reformation whic they were used to propagate."

The question of "historical necessity" in the sixteenth and seve teenth centuries is likewise a complex one, and to examine every ca in which it may be alleged would require far more space than you columns, even at their most generous, can afford. But Anglica who remember the difficulties attending the continuation of th episcopal succession at the consecration of Matthew Parker, an particularly the import of the *Supplentes* clause in this relationshi will not underrate the reality of this plea in cases where the desi to perpetuate episcopacy was attended by obstacles. Nor will they b unmindful of the reality of the danger during the Interregnum the failure of the episcopal succession in England.

I am surprised that Dr Dix thinks that I have overlooked what h calls the "regalism" of the Anglican divines of the sixteenth an seventeenth centuries, or the problems of "political allegiance an geography." In the first section of my pamphlet (pp. 3-6 of the fir edition, pp. 3-5 of the second) I emphasized this aspect of the pro lem; not at such length as I should have desired, had I been writin a book and not a pamphlet. This factor may be invoked also to e plain the reordination by some foreign Reformed churches ministers already possessing episcopal ordination; as it was similar evoked by some Reformed ministers in explanation of the reordin tion after 1662 in England of ministers ordained abroad after th presbyterian model who wished to minister in the Church of En land. Dr Dix, of course, is correct in stating that this factor w responsible for the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Anglica

opinion which made allowances for foreign Protestant churches which were denied to domestic Dissenters. Of course I accept this factor as an integral part of their attitude and opinions. An echo of this standpoint is found in No. 4 of the *Tracts for the Times*, "Adherence to the Apostolical Succession the Safest Course," which observes: "Neither do we desire to pass sentence on other persons of other countries; . . . and let men seriously bear in mind, that it is one thing to slight and disparage this holy Succession where it may be had, and another thing to acquiesce in the want of it, where it is (*if it be any where*) really unattainable."

With great respect to Dr Dix, I must maintain my position that unless Pearson can be shown explicitly to have discussed the case of foreign Protestants and disallowed it, the argument from him has the weakness as well as the strength of an argument from silence. Dr Dix replies that "when a man insists that *Ordinandi potestas Solis competit episcopis*, to infer that he rejects non-episcopal orders is an argument not from silence but from evidence." It happens that No. 74 of the *Tracts for the Times* includes in its *catena patrum* the following extract from Wake's *Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of England*, Art. 15: "We believe that it is the bishop's part only to ordain." The similarity between the words of Pearson and those of Wake is striking, and Dr Dix would presumably make the same inference in regard to Wake as he does in the case of Pearson—namely, that Wake rejected non-episcopal orders, and that this inference "is an argument not from silence but from evidence." I have shown that Wake did not reject the non-episcopal orders of the foreign Protestant churches, and therefore I must maintain my contention that the argument from Pearson, as presented by Dr Dix and Mr Kemp, is one from silence.

To summarize the position after this interchange of letters: In my pamphlet I cited the opinions of a series of Anglican divines of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries concerning episcopacy and the question of the foreign Protestant non-episcopal churches. I must leave your readers to decide whether I am correct or not in affirming that a catena which included Hooker, Whitgift, Andrewes, Bramhall, Thorndike, Taylor, Cosin, Sharp, Ussher, Wake, and others, is representative of the leading Anglicans of their times. Dr Dix makes the proper rejoinder that not all their contemporaries agreed with them. I never said that they did; and in reply to his list of more rigid divines whom I did not cite, I could produce a list of eminent divines of much laxer doctrine of the ministry, such as Whitaker and Fulke at Cambridge, and Holland, Humphreys, and Reynolds at Oxford, and in a later period Bishops Herbert Croft and Hoadly, who, notwithstanding, may claim to represent an element in the Anglican churchmanship of their day, and whom I did not quote on the other side to Pearson and Beveridge. Secondly, I argued that there is copious and cogent evidence for the general admission, and welcome, of foreign Protestants sojourning in England to communion with the Church of England; and I do not remember that this has been challenged at all in this correspondence.

Thirdly, I stated that in the matter of reciprocation of this communion, the practice of Anglicans differed, so that generalization was not possible.

Perhaps I may conclude with an eirenic quotation from a divine who might hope to satisfy all the tests of Dr Dix for being a representative writer and for stating "the common attitude of Anglicans," since he was beyond doubt a high-tory-churchman and enjoyed the further felicity of writing and publishing within the reign of Queen Anne—namely, from Jonathan Swift's *The Sentiments of a Church of England Man with respect to Religion and Government*. "To enter upon particulars: A Church of England Man hath a true veneration for the scheme established among us of ecclesiastic government; and though he will not determine whether Episcopacy be of divine right, he is sure it is most agreeable to primitive institution, fittest of all others for preserving order and purity, and under its present regulations best calculated for our civil state."

Yours sincerely,

Norman Sykes.

Emmanuel College,
Cambridge.

July 14, 1949.

[This correspondence is now closed.—Ed. Theology.]

BOOK REVIEWS

T. B. Strong. By Harold Anson. S.P.C.K. 8s. 6d.

The Master of the Temple has written a charming account of the late Bishop of Oxford. He describes him beautifully, but perhaps wisely does not attempt to explain him. The book testifies to his being a real character, and it shows above all that he was, in the words of Dr A. C. Headlam, "a very able and original administrator." His other qualities made him an outstanding don and dean, but it was during a prolonged spell as Vice-Chancellor in the difficult and empty years of the 1914-18 war that he really made his name at Oxford. He would probably have done so as a bishop, too, if he had been raised to the bench twenty years earlier. He never was a great preacher, and he was really handicapped by being totally devoid of unction, but he was a winner at befriending people and at doing and suggesting the common-sense thing, and no doubt the business would have grown upon him. As it was, he seemed not always to remember that he was a bishop, and when he did remember, to be sometimes uncommonly surprised. He was an inspired amateur all his life.

One would like to know the origin of Dr Strong's variously assorted characteristics and accomplishments, but the Master has said very little of his youth. He has not explained, for instance, how he came to be appointed Lecturer at Christ Church, and what he lectured in. One supposes that he lectured in theology, but he cannot have had much time to learn it. And what were his motives in

taking Holy Orders, and where did he get his title (it was not on a Fellowship, for he had none at the time), and what was done about his examination? But if the Master has said little of these matters, it was perhaps because no detailed account of them was recoverable. Of the situation in the University when Strong was a young don there is an interesting sketch with a somewhat alarming account of Dr Pusey. But the Master cannot put Strong into his place in the circle, he can only register his detachment from it.

The most impressive part of the book is the testimony which has been contributed by Strong's old friends and pupils; it is so unanimous in representing him as a most loving friend, a most amusing companion, a good High Church man but no Anglo-Catholic, a competent but not an outstanding scholar and divine, a person of great practical ability and aptitude for business (partly because he rather disliked it), an admirable chairman, and in his own repressed way about three parts of a saint. And what more can you ask of a bishop or a dean?

The four likenesses, with which the book is illustrated, are interesting, but not very satisfying. Rothenstein's drawing makes the dean look fanatical, which he certainly was not. The caricature of 1903 makes him look like a curate, which he certainly did not look like in 1903 nor probably at any time. Orpen's portrait of the Bishop of Ripon makes him look a very bad-tempered man, which he never was. The photograph of 1934 makes him look prim, which no man ever thought him, and also much too tidy, though happily his scarf is fearfully awry. The dust-cover is stylish.

Those of us who knew Dr Strong are very glad to have him revealed to us by the Master's book, and it will also please those who like to study unusual personalities, and those, too, who are interested in the business of the Church as it actually is. But oh! how elusive "Tommy Strong" was.

Westminster Abbey. Adam Fox.

The Old Catholic Movement. By C. B. Moss. S.P.C.K. 15s.

It is a curious fact that, although the Church of England has been in full communion with the Old Catholic Churches for some eighteen years, this is the first full-length study of Old Catholicism to be published in English. It is bound, therefore, to be a work of interest and importance. There are, moreover, few English writers so well qualified as Dr Moss to deal with the subject; his personal contacts with Old Catholic leaders have extended over many years; he was one of the architects of the Bonn agreement of 1931, by the ratification of which our intercommunion with them was established, and he has had the advantage of access to their archives and libraries.

Any study of Old Catholicism is bound to fall naturally into three parts: a study of Port Royal and the Gallican Movement leading up to the Bull *Unigenitus*; a study of the Church of Utrecht, before and after its final breach with Rome; and, lastly, a study of the Old

Catholic Movement as it has developed in various countries since the Vatican Council. This is the plan followed by Dr Moss, and he adds a prologue on "The development of the Papal Claims" and an important epilogue on the ecumenical significance of Old Catholicism.

The prologue is, I think, the least happy part of the book, not because the Papal claims are rejected, but because they appear to be rejected on second-hand evidence. Dr Moss refutes the Papal claims on patristic grounds, but only in two places does he quote directly from the Fathers; for the rest he is content with quoting them from Denny's *Papalism*, a work no doubt admirable, but no substitute for the original research which dogmatic rejection of this kind demands if it is to be taken as serious scholarship.

The tortuous story of Port Royal, and of French Gallicanism, is admirably told, and Dr Moss makes out a carefully reasoned case for the inevitable failure of Gallicanism, though I think it may still be argued that there is a case to be made out on the other side.

The story of the Church of Utrecht itself is full of interest. Dr Moss follows Neale's *History of the so-called Jansenist Church of Holland* (published in 1857) closely, though he supplements it from other sources less readily accessible. The history of the Church of Utrecht really forms the bulk of the book. The story of the rise of Old Catholicism in various countries of Europe and in America is told more briefly. Dr Moss, of course, was limited by considerations of space, but I cannot help wishing that the long (and occasionally rather tedious) history of the Dutch Church had been compressed still more, and some of the controversial chapters shortened, in order to leave room for a much more detailed study of the Old Catholic Churches of Germany, Switzerland, Austria, the Latin countries, and the Polish Church in America. What we are told whets our appetite for more, and I hope that perhaps Dr Moss may follow this book with a series of extended monographs on these countries; he is the only Englishman wholly qualified to do it.

It is Dr Moss's claim that, after the Vatican Council, "'Old Catholicism' was for Latin Christians the only alternative to Ultramontanism," and a good deal of his writing in this book appears to have in view the need for demonstrating this fact. It is a thesis which raises issues too big to be dealt with in a review. He has demonstrated the failure of Gallicanism as an historical phenomenon of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, but he has not so clearly shown that Old Catholicism is the only possible, or even a possible alternative for those to whom Ultramontanism is unacceptable. It is probably too early in the history of Old Catholicism to make an historical judgment in the matter, as it is also too early to gauge accurately the significance of the very un-Ultramontane currents of thought now abroad in certain sections of the Roman Catholic Church in Europe. It may be, however, that such movements as the *Una Sancta* in Germany, the *Mission de France* (and particularly the *Mission de Paris*), and innumerable other movements of life and thought less easily definable, are pointing the way to an alternative which is neither Gallican nor Old Catholic nor Ultramontane, it

the sense in which those terms are generally understood. In the present very fluid state of Christian thought we must more than ever beware of making "snap" judgments of this kind.

PARIS. HENRY R. T. BRANDRETH, O.G.S.

JACOB BOEHME. By Hans L. Martensen. New revised edition with notes by Stephen Hobhouse. Rockliff. 21s.

A man who has been a source of inspiration to such diverse writers as William Law and Nicolas Berdyaev, and has won high praise from historians of mysticism, may not be neglected. Gratitude is therefore due to Mr Hobhouse for having brought to light again Bishop Martensen's introduction to Jacob Boehme. An introduction and guide is necessary, for Boehme's works are not easily accessible, and their arrangement and symbolism are so complicated that many will be deterred from trying to comprehend the message he is trying to give unless assistance is forthcoming. It must be admitted, at the outset, that much of Boehme is very difficult, and some is unorthodox. Nevertheless, he had what Evelyn Underhill called "a natural genius for the transcendent," and the "inspired shoemaker" is a source of illumination who needs to be rediscovered in every age. Boehme had a talent for the exploration of the unseen, but the maps which he was able to draw are comparable only to fantastic medieval maps, full of dragons and symbolic monsters. In consequence, he has often been regarded by the orthodox as mad or heretical. Yet he was, in fact, a man who had insights of quite first-rate importance, which he was hampered in communicating by inadequate means of expression.

Boehme was concerned to show that God is living and that He is love, and he does this in his teaching about the Trinity and about creation. If he sometimes oversteps the mark in speaking of nature in God, as he tries to bring home to his readers the close relationship between God and His creatures, one cannot but recall the impression of aloofness which so many more orthodox theologians give when speaking of God. Boehme's ideas about the glory which surrounds and flows out from the eternal Godhead remind one of the divine energies to which the system of Gregory Palomas assigns so great a place. In fact, Boehme's notions often suggest an affinity with eastern orthodox theologians of whom he had presumably never even heard. This no doubt explains the influence he had on Berdyaev. Boehme, although no dualist, was fully alive to the reality and the positive nature of evil, and what he has to say about this is of importance to the contemporary world, for he is not a pessimist and is convinced that out of conflict, restlessness, disturbance, and anxiety the new man is born. He teaches that in every man there is a Nature-centre and a Light-centre, and it is only as he opens the Light-centre to the divine influence that the conflict is finished by the final victory of God over the natural forces, so that they are henceforth rightly ordered. He is less happy when he carries these speculations into his

discussion of the nature of God, but it can be seen, even when he seems to be ascribing to God what properly belongs only to fallen human nature, that he is trying to make it clear that God loves and understands and has sympathy with all the evils that beset us, and that He is not aloof from the world, but is deeply touched by the struggles and agony of His creation. The note of optimism that runs through his treatment of evil is a healthy influence in an age which is inclined to theological pessimism. The pre-mundane fall is something which fascinates some Christian thinkers, and Boehme's version of it is at least based on the scriptural theme of the fall of the angels. In conclusion, one welcomes this book as an introduction to a thinker whose ideas may be of great value to a diversity of persons, although one must always be on guard against pressing the thought or the symbolism of isolated passages to extremes. It is easy to find points to criticize in Boehme—his idea of the *ungrund* as the background of God, for instance, or his idea of God as somehow incomplete without His creation—but in a short review it seems better to call attention to what may be useful and stimulating. There is no need to take him as one's only guide, but there is much benefit to be had from reading the works of this lover of God who felt himself driven to consider the fundamentals of theology and of human nature.

WOOLAVINGTON. P. R. P. BARKER.

NOTES ON THE MEDIEVAL MONASTERIES AND MINSTERS OF ENGLAND AND WALES. By H. Ernest Roberts. S.P.C.K. 12s. 6d.

Mr Roberts' work is clearly the fruit of long and loving study of the ecclesiastical buildings of medieval England. He deserves our thanks for giving us an up-to-date and comprehensive survey of the surviving architectural remains of the monasteries of medieval England and Wales, to which he adds for good measure the greater secular churches. No longer will it be necessary to search out local guides to discover what is left of a particular religious house. The list is amazingly accurate and is illustrated by fifty excellent photographs.

It is, however, unfortunate that the writer has made so little use of easily accessible standard works on English medieval architecture and history. He seldom gives exact dates to the buildings he describes, preferring the vague and unsatisfactory terminology of Victorian times. Use of such works as A. R. Martin's *Franciscan Architecture* or Clapham's *English Romanesque Architecture* would have enabled the author to give reasonably precise dates to many of the structures he describes (it would, of course, be impossible to date them all) thereby making the book of much greater value to tourist and archæologist alike.[1] His introductory sketch on monastic history is most unsatisfactory.

[1] One of the few exact dates he gives—that of the church of Waltham (p. 38)—is a hundred years too early; see Clapham, *op. cit.*

The editing of the book could have been bettered. In a work where economy of space and matter is most desirable, an attractive but unnecessarily frivolous lay-out engrosses valuable space by the use of outsize capitals and the assignment of a whole line to each measurement and item of major buildings. The notes have no consistent scheme and are not always well chosen; thus all we are told about the Franciscan house at Yarmouth is that its remains are owned by the Great Yarmouth Historical Buildings Society, and nearly half a page is taken up with details of the post-Reformation history of St Bartholomew's, Smithfield. The photographs are unnumbered and no alphabetical index of them is provided.

Though this work suffers from severe limitations, it presents in a pleasing form interesting information not easily accessible elsewhere.

Emmanuel College,
Cambridge.

J. C. Dickinson.

The Psalms. By Elmer A. Leslie. Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, New York and Nashville. $5.

The Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament literature in Boston University School of Theology offers this bulky volume to "ministers, thoughtful laymen, and students" in order that their reading of the psalms may become "an intelligible, interesting, and inspiring experience." In a preface, Dr Leslie calls attention to three features which characterize the work: (*a*) the new translation of the psalms; (*b*) their titles and classification; (*c*) the running commentary on each psalm, section by section. The psalms have been re-grouped according to Professor Leslie's judgment of "the worshipping setting which they represent," under such headings as "Hymns, Songs, and Prayers for the Hebrew New Year," "Psalm Liturgies," "Prayers of the Falsely Accused," etc.

The new translation will be found illuminating by non-Hebraists in so far as it is based on the critical text of Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica* (third edition, 1937), but as a literary work it is unlikely to set the reader "athrill with the psalmist's vital fellowship with God" to which Dr Leslie makes such constant reference. To speak plainly, it has many bad lapses. For instance, the rendering "Cause my tossings to come into thy accounting" suggests a foreigner playing dice more than Ps. lvi, 8, and the new version of Ps. xc, 10 is scarcely less unhappy: "The number of our years—their acme is seventy years." Readers on this side of the Atlantic ought to be prepared for phrases like "the clique of Abiram" (cvi, 17) and "they concoct evil against me" (xli, 7). Some of the titles given to the psalms are straightforward enough, but too many are vague and a few are vulgar. That, at least, is one way of describing headings like: "The Heart's Bubbling Fountain," "With Our Backs to the Wall," "Living in an Antagonistic Environment," "The Upward and the Downward Look," and "Singing Where You Live."

The running commentary follows a great number of laps over a track which has become distressingly familiar after the first hundred pages. Dr Leslie has clearly devoted himself to the works of Gunkel, Mowinckel, Ehrlich, and Schmidt, and in the present work he does not appear to deviate much from their position. Any reader who has never ventured further than Kirkpatrick in the *Cambridge Bible* or Briggs in the *International Critical Commentary* will find Professor Leslie's presentation most stimulating, especially on the form and background of such psalms as xxii, xxiv, lxxxii, xci, and civ. But he must be careful not to be misled by the author's easy familiarity with the (quite hypothetical) "Hebrew New Year Festival" and his unquestioned (but highly questionable) assumption that "practically every psalm . . . was intended for rendition in the regular and officially constituted worship of the Temple" (p. 18).

The expositions, while occasionally suggestive, are too often mere paraphrase—and paraphrase of a monumental verbosity. Many points requiring detailed exposition (*Sheol* for example) are passed over with an airy generalization of the kind which tends to become tedious at the tenth repetition. Dr Leslie's enthusiasm never loses its warmth, but some of his comments freeze one's very marrow: "We feel here a spiritual kinship between this ancient pilgrim and the greatest Soul that ever entered that city as a pilgrim, who, several centuries later, like him, but with a sob in his heart, spoke unforgettable words to Jerusalem" (on cxxii); "The Temple musicians have lugged along into exile their beloved instruments, but it is no time for music!" (on cxxxvii); and "Hurtling at vast speed through the air in jet-propulsion planes, can we escape God?" (on cxxxix).

If you do not mind travelling to Zion by way of Boston, there is *something* to be gained from using Dr Leslie's itinerary.

Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge. E. W. Heaton.

The Meaning of Human Existence. By Leslie Paul. Faber. 16s.

Towards a New Epoch. By Nicolas Berdyaev. Geoffrey Bles. 6s.

Transposition and other Addresses. By C. S. Lewis. Geoffrey Bless. 2s. 6d.

Mr Paul's book will rank high among contemporary presentations of the Christian philosophy of life. It is the product of wide reading and deep thinking; it has the excitement of sustained and progressive argument, and the compulsion of a fresh and strong mind. In *The Annihilation of Man* he presented the affirmation of spirit and the restoration of Christian values as the only cure for the current ills of society; in *The Meaning of Human Existence* he proceeds from natural to revealed religion, and shows how God speaks to man through Christ on the cross. The earlier book was very remarkable; the present one confirms Mr Paul's penetration and sagacity.

He selects certain fundamental aspects of modern knowledge "in

order to draw conclusions about the universe"—he considers the atomic structure, the space-time universe, the qualities of living and evolving organisms, the idea of the person. He finds deep significance in the idea that time has a direction—that is to say, is irreversible and creative. An examination of the nature of organism leads to the idea of discontinuity in the universe. If life and man are important, the cosmos is unimportant, for life depends on will and purpose active in an anti-cosmic sense—that is, as seeking to maintain the unity and form of the organism against the universal tendency to disorder. The notion of discontinuity in the universe makes it impossible to explain all phenomena by means of one science, and his subtle examination of the crisis in psychology makes it clear that science is made sterile when the phenomena of one field are reduced to the order belonging to another. The position of the *person*, who experiences both the subjective and the objective worlds, is the key to the argument. *Without* the destruction of the reality of the immediately experienced material world, Mr Paul arrives at the idea of a reality standing behind the reality signalled to us by our senses, at the idea of an invisible and intangible reality superior to the visible and tangible one. He arrives, that is to say, at the portal of pure spirit, and can devote himself to the study of the nature of subjectivity. He is led to a God who gives meaning to the universe and who is involved in it. The tragedy of human existence lies in the fact that man is excluded from nature in that he is not wholly natural, and is excluded from God in that he is not divine but only created in the divine image. But at this point revelation comes in. The appropriateness of the Incarnation is that if there is a God, in the sense of a Being with whom the human person may have real communion in love, there is one *necessary* point at which he must reveal himself to man, and that is where the suffering is created and the stark reality most complete. That is the meaning of the Passion; and Mr Paul's statement of the central fact of the faith is the moving conclusion of the book. Man is not mocked or doomed. It is an impressive argument, and fruitful not only because it is a completed argument for the Christian faith, but because it is also an introduction to the relationship of modern thought—scientific and philosophical—to the central facts of the Christian gospel.

The title of Mr Paul's book is taken from an aphorism of Berdyaev; but Berdyaev's posthumous work is singularly disappointing, and it is not easy to see why it has been printed. For the student it adds nothing to what has been already published: for the beginner it may serve as an introduction to some of Berdyaev's characteristic ideas, but that is far better done through the excitement and brilliance of *Freedom and the Spirit* or *The Destiny of Man*. The essays illustrate a single theme—the conviction that a whole epoch of history is ending and that we are witnessing the emergence of a new world. The burden of the world's catastrophe is moral and spiritual rather than economic and political: the vast irrational forces of history sweep aside our reasonable attempt to understand it. In this travail Communism plays the most spectacular part, and it is sterile

and evil of Christians to attack it on the basis of decrepit an rational ideas. The Church must remedy the radical defects of Com munism by the emergence of a new spirituality, and in the form tion of that spirituality the Orthodox presentation of Christianii has an illuminating part to play. Occasionally in the book there ar sparks which are welcome reminders of brilliant epigrams, bu Berdyaev is, at his best, so repetitive that we might have been spare these essays.

Dr Lewis' collection of addresses, *Transposition*, is as lucid an persuasive as its predecessors. The most famous of these papers "The Weight of Glory," and the most important is the sermon whic provides the title for the book. His consideration of the continuit between things which are admittedly natural and things which, it claimed, are spiritual, leads to pertinent, and humble, reflections o such stupendous themes as the Incarnation and the doctrine of th resurrection of the body. Dr Lewis displays his usual skill in illustra tion—take, for example, his suggestion that a trio such as Rat, Mol and Badger in *The Wind in the Willows* symbolizes the extrem differentiation of persons in harmonious union which we know in stinctively to be our true refuge both from solitude and the collec tive. In his more sustained works Dr Lewis often leaves one with feeling that, for all his brilliance, he is skating on thin ice: in thes very relevant addresses, in which he elucidates one point at a time he is at his best.

RUGBY. CHARLES TOMPKINS.

THE CHRISTIAN ORIGINS OF SOCIAL REVOLT. By W. D. Morri Allen and Unwin. 12s. 6d.

This book describes movements of social revolt with Christia connexions from A.D. 320 up to A.D. 1949, chiefly in Britain, but als in other parts of Europe. This width of scope accounts for the valu and the defects of the book. The subject is an important one, o which there is inadequate authoritative writing. Almost any reade will find a great deal that is fresh and interesting, especially in th account of social movements in medieval and in Cromwellian time Much of the Cromwellian material is well documented from origina sources.

A book of 232 pages is, however, quite inadequate for a ful factual account of such a wide and complex field, but the write does not seem to have decided what to do instead. There is ver little critical examination of the facts, nor any clear principle of sele tion. Even the thesis implied in the title is never examined. Can i be claimed that the movements described have Christian *origins*, i the sense that they would not have arisen at all, except in Christen dom; or were they, as Marxists might suggest, the product o economic causes, merely taking religious colouring from their su roundings? That question is not even raised. The concluding sectio ("A New Humanism," p. 231) seems to be a pious afterthought, no integrally related to what has gone before.

The weakest parts of the book are the sections dealing with the better-known historical movements, especially the Reformation and the Methodist Revival. Mr Morris quotes only slightly from original sources, but very largely from a few modern writers (*e.g.*, Max Beer, P Gordon Walker, and the Hammonds). This gives a markedly secondhand and "scissors-and-paste" character to the book, which is made worse by the fact that the principle on which the scissors have been wielded is nowhere clear. At several points he quotes generalizations (*e.g.*, P. Gordon Walker's judgment on Calvinism), on admittedly contentious matters, as though they are the authoritative last word. It is no disrespect to these writers to say that that is not the right way to use their works.

In his treatment of the Methodist Revival, Mr Morris avoids the error of one-sided treatment; he brings out the double character of Methodism, at the same time politically conservative in many of its forms, and also a vital factor in the development of the politically radical Labour movement. Yet the picture is bloodless. Britain is unique in having had a major religious revival subsequent to the industrial revolution, which has given us a religious tradition rooted in the industrial working classes. That is a fact of quite vital importance to the understanding of our religious and political scene. Yet for all the quotations, the book completely fails to bring to life what happened then.

The account of the modern Socialist Movement is equally remote. There are a few vivid quotations from the General Strike, but very little else. Certainly there is no adequate picture of the relations of chapel, co-op., and trade union, which are recognizable even to-day. In commenting on the continuance of "chapel influence" in the modern Labour Movement, the only names quoted are the late Arthur Henderson and the Rt Hon. A. V. Alexander—a peculiarly inadequate list, having regard to the surprisingly high proportion of "chapel trained" among those holding ministerial office in the present Government, not to mention other parts of the Labour Movement. It is hard to avoid the feeling that Mr Morris has more intimate contact with the Cromwellian period than with the twentieth century!

One fact which emerges time and again in the course of the book, but which is not discussed, is the strangely ambiguous influence of Christianity. On the one hand, it has given rise to radical criticism of society and to active movements of revolt and reform; on the other hand the conditions of Church life have bred in the higher office-holders (and even in those not so high!) a peculiarly stiff and reactionary form of conservatism. This fact deserves much more careful thought than it has commonly received from those of us who are concerned with Church Order.

W. G. Symons.

Sheffield.

Saint Catherine in Tuscan Painting. By George Kaftal. Blac
friars. 10s. 6d.

St Catharine of Siena. The Seatonian Prize Poem for 1948. E
E. K. Ellis. Cambridge University Press. 1s. 6d.

The credibility of depicted legends is hardly the concern of th
iconographer, but as Dr Kaftal's book is addressed to admirers of
Catherine in general as well as to the art historian, it is reasonab
to consider the point in connexion with it. For the hagiography
the Latin Church is curious. Are its members really still expected
take these fantastic medieval inventions seriously or is their co
tinual recounting merely commended as fanciful, pious literature
The sixth centenary of the birth of the Sienese saint, now exalted
the patronage of Italy, was marked in 1937 (the date is, in fact, not b
yond question) by an outcrop of petty lives which placidly perpet
ate the obvious fictions, often repellent, of her initial biographe
Raymond of Capua, and others. The familiar motifs of saintly leger
reappear, little as they would survive the glance of a critical hi
torian. Her cult, indeed, made small progress until it began to b
used by the Dominicans as counter to the popularity of that of
Francis, with which they were in bitter rivalry, and it was more tha
eighty years before a Sienese Pope, Pius II, appeared to canonize h
townswoman and approve the ascription to her of the stigmat
The next Pope but one, however, Sixtus IV, happened to be
Franciscan, and issued a decree forbidding the depiction of Cathe
ine receiving the stigmata, which were declared the exclusi
monopoly of St Francis.

The reiteration of such contentious marvels, though in the agre
able language of selected passages from the seventeenth-centu
translation of a sixteenth-century *Life of St Catherine* by Ambros
Politi used by Dr Kaftal, casts no further illumination on the natu
of sanctity, such as one would gladly receive. To call the Arts
one's aid in such a task, especially the painting of the Sienese scho
with its predominantly mystical approach (he casts his net as far
Florence and Pisa, in addition, and brings in the workshop of F
Angelico and an uncommon panel of the Pisan school) might we
provide a key to much that words alone cannot encompass. Perha
this was partly Dr Kaftal's motive. He does not say. Unfortunate
most of the early Tuscan pictures collected here do not reveal the
quality very well in uncoloured and distinctly small photograph
reproduction. The novel Sienese Master of the Dominican Effigie
whom few can have encountered before, does not appear, from th
reproductions given, to have been outstandingly competent for
quattrocento painter, in any case; though perhaps the originals a
more impressive. Nor do the extracts from John Fen's version of th
Life act as an adequate commentary on the pictures as Art.

The result is that what, with penetrating analysis of the religio
and æsthetic inspiration of the paintings, might have been a val
able contribution to deeper understanding of Catherine in pa
ticular, and thereby to some extent of sainthood in general, remai
merely a pleasantly produced picture book.

From someone of the stature and insight of the late Charles Williams, poetry, too, might reveal of these mysteries what reasoned prose cannot. Mr Ellis has done no more than turn some incidents from a popular Roman Catholic Life of St Catherine (as he acknowledges) into facile pedestrian verse of no structural interest and small inspiration. For example:

> One hope of good remains, and she is gone
> To kneel before the Pope at Avignon—
> The small, slim, pallid scholar, Gregory.
> "Father, return! For this is the decree
> Of Heaven . . ."

And so on. The wind bloweth where it listeth, and not particularly frequently perhaps on academic exercises.

J. H. L. Waterson.

Stoke D'Abernon.

SHORTER NOTICES

The Authority of the Scriptures. By J. W. C. Wand. Mowbrays. 5s.

Fulham Palace has lately been the headquarters of a vast evangelistic enterprise, but the literary output of the bishop has certainly not been diminished in consequence. His most recent book was perhaps designed to be a contribution to the Mission by recalling the laity to serious Bible-study. While, however, it is not intended to be a contribution to current theological discussion, it unfortunately does not interpret the living issues of theology to the general reader as well as some of the admirable talks broadcast over the B.B.C. Dr Wand describes the composition of the Old and New Testaments, alluding to Form Criticism but not developing the implications, and the formation of the canon; and he stresses the limitations of biblical authority and the degrees of inspiration. It is possible, however, that the general reader ought to be told about the burning problem of the relation of historical criticism to theological affirmation, and it is certain that readers of Theology would like to know what so influential a bishop thinks of the important books that have been reviewed in these pages over the last ten years. The only hint is found on p. 95: "Most theological literature more than fifty years old can be disregarded."

Hove. Wilfrid Browning.

Sense and Nonsense. By Cyril Alington. Basil Blackwell. 7s. 6d. net.

What is Basic Christianity? One salutary result of reading the Dean of Durham's book is that one is stimulated into answering the question for oneself. Faith and repentance; reception into the Church by baptism; the life of prayer and sacrament within that

fellowship; the type of conduct that springs from the inwardness of such a life illuminated by Holy Scripture. All of these headings do undoubtedly, receive treatment, though perhaps not with all the emphasis they deserve nor with the clarity of definition that one would desire.

Very little is said, for instance, about prayer. The statement "Basic Christianity . . . does not involve allegiance to any particular church," evidently envisages an undenominationalism so comprehensive as to be meaningless. Credal statements are treated with a largeness of gesture that their history hardly warrants: "everyone who sings 'God save the King' and means what he says, is in fact making a profession of faith, none the less real because it is not in credal form."

The Dean's book would seem to have taken its origin in a number of brilliant marginal comments: the pages on Crypto-Baptism are delightfully shrewd; those on the Jews full of a ripe wisdom; and each section, however slightly sketched in, has some thought well worth the pondering. It might have been better to publish these luminous annotations for their own sakes rather than be tempted to work them up into a "system."

As always, the Dean writes with gusto. Allusive, arresting, witty, one catches the delightful atmosphere of a discussion with an intelligent sixth form. It is, perhaps, somewhat ironical that, although its aim is to demonstrate the limitations of a common-sense approach to spiritual matters, one lays the book down feeling that, above all else, Dr Alington has been a master of sweet reasonableness and reassuringly unparadoxical common-sense.

North Berwick. Lawrence Wilson.

Le Mystère de l'Avent. By Jean Daniélou. Editions due Seuil. N.p.

This is a moving book, written with the restrained passion which seems to characterize the school of Missiology in French Catholicism and containing some memorable sentences such as can be contrived only in the French language. Its theme is the twofold relation of the Gospel to the non-Christian religions, which is to be found in the Bible and the Fathers. Historically, Christianity succeeds to the other religions in time, fulfils them, and renews them. "Le christianisme est l'éternelle jeunesse du monde." "Ce qui caractérize le christianisme, c'est une certaine totalité." Dramatically, Christianity negates the other religions, and they must die into her if they are to live and bear fruit.

The substance of the book, which is not always closely related to this theme, consists of expositions of biblical figures as precursors of Christ and as pointers to the missionary task of the Church. Abraham is the type of conversion and faith, and in the covenant with him which inaugurates sacred history there is already contained the possibility of the salvation of the world. The birth of Isaac pre

figures the Virgin Birth, the sacrifice of Isaac the Cross and Resurrection; the blessing of Ishmael is the mystery of election. Melchisedek is the type of nature religion which finds its sacraments fulfilled when it dies into the religion of revelation. The Baptist, "l'homme de la plus grande violence et de la plus grande douceur," is the type of those who are completely detached from the world in order to be completely attached to the Christ. The angels, whom the author bids us take seriously as the Christian counterpart to the expanding universe of science, are the guardians of the nations; the Virgin is the embodiment of the true Israel, the Church, and is mysteriously present among heathen people in advance of the arrival of Christ and the visible Church. The book closes with an exposition of the cosmic significance of the Cross and the Ascension, and of the prophetic office of Christ.

The author quotes with approval from the work of non-Roman biblical scholars, and his study provides an admirable illustration of both the advantages and the perils of typological exegesis. In the case of figures which have already become types within the Bible itself it is an indispensable method, but in the case of the historical figures of the New Testament it can lead to uncontrolled fancy. It is significant that in the treatment of Mary the biblical text is almost abandoned, and the logical conclusion of some of the statements would seem to be a doctrine of the pre-existence of the Virgin.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford. C. F. Evans.

The Bible in Basic English. Cambridge University Press. 12s. 6d.

The New Testament in Basic English was reviewed by Charles Williams in Theology, August, 1941. What he said of that applies equally, it seems to us, to the Old Testament in Basic English. The publishers say that this version "is intended to bring the English Bible to the many potential new readers all over the world who know only a little English, and also to provide a simple translation for those from whom the rich Elizabethan prose of the Authorized Version sometimes conceals, by its very familiarity, the plain meaning of the text." Provided these limited purposes are recognized, there can be nothing but praise for the achievement. It is a version which every reader of the English Bible may with advantage have at hand, though no one in his senses will be satisfied to depend on it alone. It is handsomely produced and moderately priced.

A. R. V.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.)

AKATEEMINEN KIRJAKAUPPA (HELSINKI): Oslo Tiililä, *A Hundred Years of Syste matic Theology in Finland* (Publication of the Finnish Theological Literat ture Society) (n.p.).

ALLEN AND UNWIN: M. Hiriyanna, *The Essentials of Indian Philosoph* (12s. 6d.).

ASSOCIATION FOR PROMOTING RETREATS: *General List of Retreats to Februar 1950* (9d.).

BLACKFRIARS PUBLICATIONS: A. H. Armstrong, *The Real Meaning of Plotinus' Intelligible World* (1s.).

BLACKWELL: R. W. Howard, *Should Women be Priests?* (Three Sermon preached before the University of Oxford.) (2s. 6d.)

BLOUD AND GAY (PARIS): *Réflexions sur la Psychanalyse* (Fr. 225).

BUREAU OF CURRENT AFFAIRS: T. E. Jessop, *Why Religion?* (2s.).

BURNS OATES: Ronald Knox, *On Englishing the Bible* (6s.); H. Van Zeller O.S.B., *Stories* (Re-issue of *From Creation to Christmas*) (6s. 6d.).

CARWAL PUBLICATIONS: W. J. Doidge and R. W. Thompson, *Film Strip Do' and Don'ts* (6d.).

CHRISTIAN ACTION FELLOWSHIP: William Robinson, *The Sacraments and Lif* (1s.).

CLARENDON PRESS: J. F. Stenning (Ed.), *The Targum of Isaiah* (30s.).

DACRE PRESS: Gabriel Marcel, *Being and Having* (10s. 6d.).

DESCLÉE DE BROUWER (PARIS): Jérôme Hamer, O.P., *Karl Barth* (n.p.).

EPWORTH PRESS: J. Brice, *The Book Supreme* (10s. 6d.).

HODDER AND STOUGHTON: Henry Bett, *The Reality of the Religious Lif* (9s. 6d.).

INDEPENDENT PRESS: C. E. Norwood, *The Call* (6s.).

LONGMANS: E. L. Mascall, *Existence and Analogy* (12s. 6d.).

MACMILLAN: B. E. Maland, *The Reawakening of Christian Faith* (7s. 6d.).

METHUEN: M. L. Sjoestedt, *Gods and Heroes of the Celts* (8s. 6d.).

MITRE PRESS: J. E. Roscoe, *A New Philosophy of the Universe and Life* (2nd ed.) (6s.).

MONASTÈRE DE CHEVETOGNE (BELGIUM): E. Mercenier, *La Prière des Églises d Rite Byzantin II. Les Fêtes* (n.p.).

NATIONAL SOCIETY AND S.P.C.K.: Florence Taylor, *The Church's Faith and the Kindergarten Child* (3s. 6d.); Doris R. Allder, *The World's Book* (1s. 4d.); Helen Harrison, *Nick and Cecillia in York Minster* (7s. 6d.).

PICKERING AND INGLIS: G. A. Neilson, *Tales of Great Truths* (5s. 6d.).

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION PRESS: E. H. Hayes and F. S. Popham, *Heroes of th Way* (5s.).

S.C.M. PRESS: T. R. Milford, *A Christian Philosophy of Sex* (6d.); George Whitfield, *God and Man in the Old Testament* (8s. 6d.).

SHELDON PRESS: Constance E. Padwick, *With Him in His Temptations* (4s.).

S.P.C.K.: George Youell, *Africa Marches* (5s. 6d.); Gordon W. Ireson, *Think Again* (2s.); Walter and Hugh Kendrick, *The New Testament for th Children: Book V—The Life Story of Jesus* (5s.); A. C. Don, *The Scottish Book of Common Prayer, 1929* (6s. 6d.); Roger Lloyd, *The Book o Common Prayer and the Pastoral Ministry* (1s. 3d.); A. A. Bale, *Th Maker's Handbook* (1s. 6d.).

TYNDALE PRESS: P. E. Hughes *The Divine Plan for Jew and Gentile* (2s.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher

HEFFER

OF

CAMBRIDGE

will pay good prices for

THEOLOGICAL BOOKS

especially the following :

St. Augustine's Works, sets
Calvin's Works, in English
Century Bible, sets
Duchesne. History of the Church, 3 vol.
Grimm-Thayer. Lexicon to New Testament Greek
Gwatkin. Early Church History, 2 vols.
do. Knowledge of God, 2 vols.
Hastings. Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics
do. Dictionary of the Bible
Hatch and Redpath. Concordance to Septuagint
Harnack. History of Dogma
Henry Bradshaw Society Publications
International Critical Commentaries, any vols.
Lightfoot. Commentaries on the Epistles
Moffatt Commentaries, any vols.
Stephens and Hunt. History of the Christian Church
Gore's Commentary
Swete. St Mark
do. Apocalypse
Westcott. St. John's Gospe
do. St. John's Epistles
do. Hebrews

and for standard books on any subject

W. HEFFER & SONS LIMITED

CAMBRIDGE

MARCION AND HIS INFLUENCE

By E. C. BLACKMAN 12s. 6d.

Mr Blackman, in his scholarly and well-documented study, considers, from the dispassionate viewpoint of to-day, Marcion's work as the organiser of a Christian Church, as Biblical critic, canon-maker, textual emendator and theologian. He has attempted to trace the effect of Marcion's work in the larger context of Catholic Christianity, and presents an estimate of Marcion's significance in the history of Christianity.

" It is a thorough and scholarly piece of work firmly based on the known facts and showing a fine appreciation of the real issues between Marcion and the Church . . . a powerful tonic for theologians." *Manchester Guardian.*

MEDIEVAL MONASTERIES AND MINSTERS

By H. E. ROBERTS Coloured frontispiece and 32 pp. plates. 12s. 6d.

A concisely summarised, yet full and reliable, description of all the interesting monastic remains in England, with a careful classification according to the order of their foundation.

" There is nothing like it available to the general public, and Mr Roberts has evidently collected his material with great patience and circumspection over a long period. .. We have every reason to be grateful to Mr Roberts for what he has assembled and presented in so handy a form." *The Listener.*

S · P · C · K

Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C.2

"Theology" occasional papers

New Series

No. 2. The Doctrine of Justification in the Anglican Reformers
By A. H. REES, M.A. 1s.

No. 3. Jesus Christ in Faith and History
An Inaugural Lecture in the University of Durham, October 25, 1940.
By A. M. RAMSEY, M.A. 6d.

No. 4. A "New Deal" for the Church of England
The Substance of a Sermon before the University of Oxford in St Mary's, on Sexagesima Sunday, February 16, 1941.
By the Rt Rev. LESLIE S. HUNTER, Bishop of Sheffield. 3d.

No. 5. The Significance of the Barmen Declaration for the OEcumenical Church 2s.

No. 6. Life after the Spirit
By M. CHANING-PEARCE. 1s.

No. 7. Celibacy and Marriage
A Study in Clerical Vocation.
By HENRY R. T. BRANDRETH and SHERWIN BAILEY 2s.

No. 8. Reform of the Ecclesiastical Law
By G. B. BENTLEY. 1s.

No. 9. The Anglican Interpretation of the Fourth Commandment
Here is an important contribution to the study of perhaps the most difficult of the Ten Commandments to explain to the modern world.
By R. P. McDERMOTT. 6d.

No. 10. Marriage, Divorce and the Church
Chaos or Reform—Which?
By A. T. MACMILLAN. 1s.

No. 11. The Church of England and the Non-Episcopal Churches in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries
An Essay towards an Historical Interpretation of the Anglican Tradition from Whitgift to Wake.
By Prof. NORMAN SYKES. 1s. 6d.

No. 12. John Wesley in Northumberland
An account of Wesley's work in Northumberland, with details of places and dates.
By H. POLLARD. 1s.

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE
Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C.2